

Organization 700 Bldg Room SEN
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
If Undeliverable Return in Ten Days


OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

HODG001 142033263 1308 17-04-18/09
FORWARD TIME EXP RTN TO SEND
: HODGSON RUSSE
140 PEARL ST STE 100
BUFFALO NY 14202-4040
RETURN TO SENDER



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

1755

APPLICATION NO.	FILED DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,593	05/17/2006	Edgar Von Gellhorn	041281.00010	3553
7590	04/10/2009		EXAMINER TUROCY, DAVID P	
David L Principe Hodgson Russ Suite 2000 One M&T Plaza Buffalo, NY 14203-2391			ART UNIT 1792	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 04/10/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/579,593	VON GELLHORN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAVID TUROCY	1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/16/06.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 8, 13, and 14 objected to because of the following informalities: Claims include "has/have been" language which should more reasonable be "is/are". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claim 10 provides for the use of an outer layer, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1, 2, and 10 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5565049, by Simmons et al.

Simmons discloses a PTFE coated conveyer belt, which inherently has an inner and outer coating as required by the claim (Column 4). The references uses the outer layer as required by claim 10. While the prior art does not disclose plasma, the claims are directed to the product and the applicant has not provided any factual evidence that the claims product is materially different then the prior art product.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-4 and 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simmons as applied to claim 1-2 above.

Simmons fails to explicitly disclose the PTFE thickness, however, determination of a film thickness is well within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art and Simmons discloses the coating is applied for a specific reason, as a release coating, and therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to determine the appropriate and optimum PTFE thickness, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

8. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simmons as applied to claim 1-2 above in view of US Patent 5744241 by Hobson et al. , US Patent 5244730 by Nguyen et al., and US Patent 4767641 by Kieser et al.

Claims 1 and 5: Simmons discloses a PTFE release coating on the surface of a conveyor belt as discussed above, but fails to explicitly disclose a plasma process. However, Hobson discloses PTFE release coatings are known in the art to be deposited by plasma process (column 3, lines 40-45), Nguyen discloses known and suitable plasma conditions for PTFE film formation, and Kieser discloses plasma can be used to deposit films on various substrates. Therefore, taking the references' collectively it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Simmons to deposit the PTFE coating with a plasma process with a reasonable expectation of successful and predictable results because Hobson discloses PTFE is deposited by plasma process, Nguyen discloses known plasma processes for depositing the PTFE and Kieser discloses various substrate can be plasma coated.

Claims 2-4, 11: The process will inherently include an under layer and an outer layer (i.e. can not form a layer without first an under layer and thereafter an outer layer, the natural progression of deposition of films.) The references fails to explicitly disclose

the PTFE thickness, however, determination of a film thickness is well within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art and Simmons discloses the coating is applied for a specific reason, as a release coating, and therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine the appropriate and optimum PTFE thickness, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Claim 7: Nguyen discloses 13.56 MHz as the plasma power (Column 3, lines 60-62).

Claim 8-9, 14: Nguyen discloses C₂F₄.

Claim 10: Simmons discloses use as claimed.

9. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simmons as applied to claim 1-2 above in view of US Patent 5744241 by Hobson et al. and US Patent 5888591 by Gleason et al.

Claims 1 and 5: Simmons discloses a PTFE release coating on the surface of a conveyor belt as discussed above, but fails to explicitly disclose a plasma process. However, Hobson discloses PTFE release coatings are known in the art to be deposited by plasma process (column 3, lines 40-45) and Gleason discloses a method for deposition of a PTFE coating on the surface of a substrate that provides increased flexibility (Column 3) and discloses pulsing power to form multiple layers with an increase in film properties (figures for examples). Therefore, taking the references'

collectively it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Simmons to deposit the PTFE coating with a plasma process with a reasonable expectation of successful and predictable results because Hobson discloses PTFE is deposited by plasma process Gleason discloses known plasma processes for depositing the PTFE onto any number of substrates to reap the benefit of increased film flexibility and properties

Claims 2-4, 11: The process will inherently include an under layer and an outer layer (i.e. can not form a layer without first an under layer and thereafter an outer layer, the natural progression of deposition of films.) The references fails to explicitly disclose the PTFE thickness, however, determination of a film thickness is well within the skill of one of ordinary skill in the art and Simmons discloses the coating is applied for a specific reason, as a release coating, and therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine the appropriate and optimum PTFE thickness, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Claim 6: The pulsing results in different plasmas as required by the claim.

Claims 7 and 12: Gleason discloses 13.56 MHz as the plasma power (column 11, lines 50-55).

Claim 8-9 and 13-14: Nguyen discloses C₂F₄,

Claim 10: Simmons discloses use as claimed.

Information Disclosure Statement

10. The information disclosure statement filed 6/16/2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each reference listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. The crossed out references on the PTO-1449 are in a foreign language and there is no concise statement as to the relevance.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID TUROCY whose telephone number is (571)272-2940. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00, No 2nd Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David Turocy/
Examiner, Art Unit 1792

Notice of References Cited		Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination VON GELLHORN ET AL.	
		Examiner DAVID TUROCY	Art Unit 1792	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A	US-5,565,049	10-1996	Simmons et al.	156/62.6
*	B	US-5,888,591	03-1999	Gleason et al.	427/522
*	C	US-5,244,730	09-1993	Nguyen et al.	428/336
*	D	US-5,744,241	04-1998	Hobson et al.	428/422
*	E	US-4,767,641	08-1988	Kieser et al.	427/569
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			


FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.



Please type a plus sign inside this box +

PTO/508B(05/03)

Approved for use through 05/31/2003, OMB 0651-0031

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT BY APPLICANT <i>(Use as many sheets as necessary)</i>				Application Number	10/579,593
Sheet 2 of 2				Filing Date	May 17, 2006
				First Named Inventor	von Gellhorn
				Group Art Unit	
				Examiner Name	
				Attorney Docket Number	041281.00010

NON PATENT LITERATURE DOCUMENTS

Examiner Initials*	Cite No. ¹	Include name of the author (in CAPITAL LETTERS), title of the article (when appropriate), title of the item (book, magazine, journal, serial, symposium, catalog, etc.), date, page(s), volume-issue number(s), publisher, city and/or country where published.	²
		Document entitled in handwriting as "Houben-Weyl: Methoden der org. Chemie 4. Auflage Band E 20 Teil 1.	
		Document IKV-Kolloquium Aachen 2000.	
		Website printout from the Institute of Polymer Research in Dresden, Germany (http://www.ipfdd.de/people/nitschke/plasma.html)	
		Website printout for PS 1010's air-to-air design (http://www.4thstate.com/PS%201010.htm)	

Examiner Signature	/David Turocy/	Date Considered	04/09/2009
--------------------	----------------	-----------------	------------

*EXAMINER: Initial if reference considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609. Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

¹ Applicant's unique citation designation number. ² Applicant is to place a check mark here if English Translation is attached.

Burden Hour Statement: The form is estimated to take 2.0 hours to complete. Time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. Send to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.